

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the outstanding Office Action dated June 15, 2004 wherein the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-15 and 18-22. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The rejection under 35 USC Section 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8-16, and 18-20 as being anticipated by Richards (5,247,358). The Examiner stated in response to Applicant's previous arguments that "[a]s stated in column 5, lines 49-52, the test image is selected by the user during the start-up phase presentation. By selecting the test image, the image adjustment process is activated. Conversely, by turning off the process or the unit, the adjustment process is deactivated. Therefore, Richards clearly meets the activating/deactivating limitations as claimed". Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as it may apply to the amended claims on the grounds that Richards does not show "wherein the demonstration means are further adapted to activate and deactivate said processing operation repeatedly during the presentation of the demonstration signals, thereby demonstrating the effect of said selected signal processing operation on the demonstration signals."

Applicants take this opportunity to explain Applicants' invention. Applicants invention permits the effect of a signal processing operation to be demonstrated on a test signal repeatedly, so that a viewer can see the effect of the signal processing operation. Many times, it is difficult to explain in words what a signal processing operation does to a picture. By having the demonstration of it activate and deactivate repeatedly the viewer can see what the signal processing operation does to the image.

Richards on the other hand pertains to graphical pictures that are chosen to allow a user to properly adjust a picture parameter. Applicants' invention however is not limited to user-adjustable parameters. Applicants' invention pertains to demonstrating a signal processing operation to the viewer. The demonstration operation is repeatedly activated and deactivated so that the user can view its effects. Although the examiner is right that by selecting the image the image adjustment process is activated and by turning off the TV it is deactivated, this is not what is meant by Applicants claims. Applicants' claims have been amended to include the word repeatedly so that it is apparent that this demonstration operation is shown to the viewer and activated and deactivated repeatedly so that the viewer can easily see its

effects on the test signal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are now allowable.

The rejection under 35 USC Section 103

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 17, 21 and 22 under 35 USC Section 103a as being unpatentable over Richards in view of Capitant. Applicants have cancelled these claims making this rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are now allowable over the cited references. Entry of this Amendment reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

----- Respectfully submitted, -----

By 

Laurie E. Gathman, Reg. 37,520
Attorney
(914) 333-9605

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On

By

Aug. 20 2004
